

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,183	07/08/2003	Erin Jessica Lindsay	033528-001	7109
BURNS DOA	7590 08/20/200 NE SWECKER & M	EXAM	EXAMINER	
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404			LANG, AMY T	
Alexandria, V	A 22313-1404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3731		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/614,183	LINDSAY, ERIN JESSICA	
Examiner	Art Unit	
AMY T. LANG	3731	

•	LAUIIIIICI	Aironic	í				
	AMY T. LANG	3731	l				
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 01 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailling date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailling date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office are may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed we have the filed was the file	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
<ol> <li>∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because         (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);         (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);     </li> </ol>							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1							
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•					
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ol>		be entered and an e	planation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-5 and 11-14</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
/Todd E Manahan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731	/Amy T Lang/ Examiner, Art Unit 3731						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3, NOTE: The amendment to claim 7 requires further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Glin does not disclose a conical exterior. However, a cone qualifies as a shape whose base is circle and whose sides taper to a point. As shown in Figure 2 of Glinn, member (20) clearly has a circular base. Although only one side of 20 is slanted, the two sides together taper to a point. Therefore, the distal end of 20 overlaps a cone portion. Furthermore, applicant also argues that when the manipilator fork of Glinn is fully retracted, a conical profile of the exterior surface of the cone is not maintained, as shown in Sketch A of the Remarks filed 08/1/2008. However, the instant claims do not recite this limitation. As shown in sketch A, the manipulator fork is retracted and not able to pass through the exterior surface of the cone portion due to the size of the lumen in the cone portion.